

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 have been pending this application, of which claims 3 and 6 have been withdrawn from consideration. By this Preliminary Amendment, claims 1, 2, 4 and 5 are amended, and new claims 7-10 are added to further set forth the application. No new matter has been introduced. Support for claims 5-10, as amended and added, can be found, e.g., on pages 11, 17 and 18 of the specification. Accordingly, claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 7-10 are now pending and submitted for consideration thereof.

Pursuant to a Request for Continued Examination concurrently submitted herewith, the previously filed Amendment dated April 21, 2003 must now be entered and arguments thereof reconsidered. Additionally, it is respectfully requested that claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 7-10, as amended and added, are allowable for the additional reasons as set forth below.

An adhesive film for a display according to the claimed invention has an effect which is superior in productivity without decreasing any anti-reflection property by coloring an adhesive layer.

By contrast, *Nishizawa* merely discloses a body color for a cathode ray tube that can be changed to an achromatic color by adding a coloring matter to a low refractive index layer formed on a surface thereof, and such does not disclose or require that an adhesive layer is provided, or that the adhesive layer is already colored as set forth in the claimed invention.

Adding *Shroeder*, which teaches a colorless and transparent laminated structure including an anti-reflective film layer, does not supplement for this deficiency.

Moreover, one skilled in the art would not have been motivated to apply coloring to the laminated structure as to form a relationship in complementary colors.

Additionally, the anti-reflection technique in **Schroeder** is obtained by forming a roughened surface on a surface thereof, and therefore is different from the techniques of the claimed invention, or from **Nishizawa** which provides a low refractive index layer on a surface thereof.

In short, there is simply no ground at all for applying the technical means of **Nishizawa** to **Schroeder** since the anti-reflection technical means of **Nishizawa** is completely different from that of **Schroeder** as described above, and the combination of **Nishizawa** and **Schroeder** would not have disclosed or taught each and every element or limitation as now set forth in claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 7-10.

Moreover, as discussed in a previous Response, **Schroeder** does not have a multilayer anti-reflective layer. Both techniques of **Nishizawa** and **Schroeder** are also attained by completely different technical means. For instance, **Nishizawa** teaches an anti-reflection technique due to forming a multilayer anti-reflective layer. By contrast, **Schroeder** teaches an anti-reflection technique due to simply roughening the surface, as described above. Therefore, even using impermissible hindsight gleaned from the claimed invention, it is respectfully submitted that there is no reasonable ground for combining **Nishizawa** with **Schroeder**, regardless of same or different fields of endeavor.

It is also submitted that even if **Nishizawa** is applied to **Schroeder**, one skilled in the art cannot arrive at the claimed construction of using complementary colors of

different layers to achieve an achromatic adhesive film since no pertinent description thereof is found in either *Schroeder* or *Nishizawa*.

In view of the above remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, Applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. The Commissioner is authorized to charge payment for any additional fees which may be required with respect to this paper to Counsel's Deposit Account 01-2300.

Respectfully submitted,

Arent Fox Kintner Plotkin & Kahn, PLLC



Raymond J. Ho
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 41,838

Customer No. 004372
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339
Tel: (202) 857-6000
Fax: (202) 638-4810
RJH/kf (#183882)